

Prior to the passage of the Medicare Modernization Act, which established the Medicare part D prescription drug program, dual eligibles received their medications by simply taking their prescriptions and their Medicaid card to a pharmacy of their choice and paying a nominal fee.

With the passage of part D, this simple process changed and dual eligibles were required to pick a plan from the new program or be automatically and randomly enrolled in one.

Unfortunately, due to the life challenges faced by these cognitively impaired individuals, their attempt to navigate the array of complex prescription drug plans was overwhelming with regrettable consequences.

Many mistakenly chose or were enrolled in plans that presented obstacles including: prohibited copays, limited formularies, and medication exclusions.

Their lack of access to prescribed medications has been linked to serious adverse events, including increased emergency room visits and hospitalizations.

To eliminate these access problems, I, together with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), have introduced the Guidance, Understanding and Information for Dual Eligibles Act, or the GUIDE Act.

The GUIDE Act addresses the life-threatening issue by establishing a pilot program where experienced social workers and case managers will provide dual eligibles with one-on-one counseling for Medicare part D in their community mental health centers and community nonprofit centers.

This program will benefit this group of vulnerable Americans by ensuring tangible access to the medications they so badly need to live healthy and productive lives. In addition, this program will benefit all Americans by reducing the social and economic costs associated with lack of access to essential medications.

Mr. Speaker, the GUIDE Act is an important bill that will provide one of the most vulnerable groups in our society with the information, guidance, and understanding they need to successfully choose the Medicare part D prescription drug plan that meets their health care needs for survival and a healthier and better quality of life.

On behalf of the millions of cognitively disabled and mentally ill Americans who live in all of our districts, I strongly urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support the GUIDE Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAKING HUMAN SPACE FLIGHT A PRIORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I had the great privilege of watching the launch of the Space Shuttle *Atlantis* at Kennedy Space Center.

As a resident of Brevard County, Florida, it is an experience of which I will never tire, and one which I earnestly encourage everyone to see, especially Members of Congress and the President, while they still can.

While we have the grandeur of Monday's launch fresh in our minds, I find the proposed NASA budget very disappointing. The budget plan essentially flatlines NASA's budget for the next 5 years and appears to spawn an abrupt end to the space shuttle in 2010. Washington is spending trillions of dollars on other programs, but has not seen fit to make human space flight a priority at this time.

NASA will attempt to complete the remaining flights of the space station manifest in 2010 within the constraints of its budgetary strait jacket. However, any flights that extend beyond September 2010 will be funded by borrowing money from the next generation vehicle, the Constellation, under the just released 2010 budget plan. The plan is unacceptable to me, and I hope it is unacceptable to you and my other colleagues.

Also disappointing is the proposed open-ended review of the shuttle's successor and the fact it was not begun months ago. Time is of the essence as critical decisions are being made today that will impact NASA for the next several decades.

America's space shuttle only has eight, possibly nine more launches. After that, many of the world's greatest engineers and technicians will be laid off from their jobs, and American taxpayers will pay Russians hundreds of millions, if not billions, of dollars to take American astronauts to the international space station.

This ironic arrangement is likely to last for a minimum of 3 years, and likely longer, until the next generation launch vehicle comes online. Various memos and budget blueprints in Washington may portray this arrangement with the Russians as an unwelcome necessity, but it has become a necessity only due to a lack of America's priorities.

It is wishful thinking on bureaucratic whiteboards that America can lay off this invaluable workforce and 3 years or more later expect to regroup them and rebrand them in the shuttle's successor program.

The transition is unlikely to seamless, and I speak from experience. In my younger days, I worked on the Apollo 11 program. I had the best job in the whole world that anyone my age could possibly have: inspecting rockets bound for the moon. But when the pro-

gram came to an end, and it came abruptly, I and many of my fellow colleagues, some of the brightest minds in the world, excepting me, of course, were given pink slips.

Mr. Speaker, Monday's launch represents one thing that the United States is undeniably, unequivocally, and universally respected for around the globe. Friends and foes alike acknowledge that the United States of America is truly the leader in space.

So it is astonishing to me that we are so near the brink of yielding this military and economic high ground to Russia or China, or someone else. Let us bear in mind that the Chinese are not going to the moon solely to collect moon rocks.

History has shown a progression in regards to our security, which we ignore at our own peril. It started back in Old Testament times when whoever could wield the biggest bone controlled the security of the land. And then who could muster the biggest army, and then who could get the straightest spears and strongest shields.

□ 1815

And then, whoever had the strongest Navy—you know, Sweden and Spain, the greatest powers in the world. And then in World War I, whoever could build the most mechanized army, that could build the most tanks determined how secure the world would be. And in World War II, it was the Air Force; whoever controlled the air would control the security of this world. And today, it's space; whoever controls space will control what security there will be on this Earth.

Today, conflict between nations has also evolved beyond bayonets, bullets and bombs; we are in an economic war of survival. I fear that many take our position for granted and assume that our prosperity will continue indefinitely into the future because we have been so blessed with prosperity thus far.

The President has said he wants half of our Nation's GDP to come from high-tech, and as you know, you can't get any more high-tech than space. We take for granted the countless spinoffs and inventions from NASA, which has issued over 6,000 patents. NASA's "spinoff database" lists over 1,600 items since 1976. Farmers rely on their weather satellites. We all rely on GPS now. We don't give a second thought to the use of our cell phones or our BlackBerry's, our laptops, or even Velcro for that matter. I can remember when a computer processor used to take up an entire room. Now, for \$5 you can go down to Wal-Mart and get a little calculator that will fit in your wallet and do the same things.

Mr. Speaker, nothing represents the future and what is possible for mankind more than space. The future is not yet written. We have not yet reached the point of no return. The NASA budget is not etched in stone. We can make the right decisions to reduce the space gap, minimize the loss

of our shuttle workforce, and move ahead with the shuttle's successor. These objectives are compatible, desirable, and overlap with the President's stated intentions to strengthen technology as our economic base.

In conclusion, I call on the leaders of this body to revamp the NASA budget and to think about the implications should we travel down the path as currently set. America can do better, and future generations of Americans deserve better.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IN SUPPORT OF 2009 SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to lend my strong support for the supplemental aid funding that the House will be considering this week. This bill represents accountability to the taxpayers and a robust commitment to our national security and stability around the world.

In December, I had the privilege of visiting with our troops and military leaders in Afghanistan. I met with Americans who are doing incredible work to help the Afghan people take ownership of their economy and provide security in their neighborhoods. The administration's plan for refocusing our attention on Afghanistan incorporates both the U.S. military component but also builds up training for the Afghan military and police, government reforms, funding for economic development, and training of the Afghan people to grow alternative crops and build roads and irrigation systems.

I want to ensure that our troops in Afghanistan are as safe as possible. Therefore, I'm proud to support the fiscal 2009 supplemental bill which includes \$2.2 billion more than requested for mine-resistant, ambush-protected vehicles to protect our troops. Not only is it imperative that we provide servicemembers everything they need to complete their mission safely, we must also provide them with everything they have earned upon their return to civilian life.

Our troops and their families have given everything to this mission. We know that some of our troops have missed family milestones, others have suffered financial setbacks, and many others have experienced psychological trauma. This bill provides for expanded counseling services, state-of-the-art equipment for our wounded warriors, and funds to reintegrate our troops

back into civilian life and the workforce when they return home.

Some members of the military were told that their service would last a certain amount of time, and then they were told that they would be "stop-losses"—that means that their tour would be extended. To me, this shows a certain amount of disrespect for those who put on the uniform. It was a difficult decision to ask them to go back, but there also needs to be a sense of fairness on how they're compensated for that. It doesn't help their readiness or our readiness for our national security to have low morale among our troops. That is why I am very proud that this supplemental retroactively pays servicemembers and veterans \$500 for every month that they've served under stop-loss orders since 2001. This is long overdue, and it's the right thing to do.

Our troops in Afghanistan will also be safer if we find regional solutions; that will include strengthening our current initiatives in Pakistan. Recently, General Petraeus, who is doing an excellent job for us, came to Palm Beach County in Florida in my district. We talked about it, and he told me—and I think we all understand this, as members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that Pakistan and Afghanistan have become a single threat and a single issue because of this threat.

Training the Pakistani security forces to confront the Taliban will help the Pakistani Government regain its foothold and prevent it from being a failed state, which is an unacceptable threat to us and the region. This could not be more urgent. Our aid must communicate security priorities, including the Pakistani Government's assurances to safeguard the border of Pakistan and Afghanistan, and also to secure the nuclear facilities and weapons that they have.

Lastly, I would like to touch upon how the supplemental aid bill treats aid to the Middle East.

President Obama, Secretary Clinton, and Special Envoy Mitchell have provided U.S. leadership in the region to advance the causes of peace and security. However, the engagement would become more difficult if the Palestinians were to form a national unity government, including Hamas.

I support our current policy—no aid to terrorist organizations, no aid to any group that incites violence, promotes and implements terrorist attacks, and kidnaps young men without regard to human rights. This bill that we're considering is clear: no aid to Hamas.

In the event that a unity government denounces violence, abides by PLO and PA agreements, and recognizes Israel as a Jewish state, then we can start the conversation about aid. In that case, according to this bill, if the President can certify that these conditions have been met, then aid can be released to the unity government and only under those circumstances.

Furthermore, current restrictions maintain that U.S. taxpayer funds to the U.N. Relief and Works Agency, UNRWA, which administers aid to Palestinian refugees, may not be used or diverted to fund terrorism or any activities of a terrorist group. I would urge the State Department to ensure that these restrictions are followed in both the letter and the spirit of the law, and to remain absolutely vigilant in investigating any possible infractions.

Finally, I would like to continue to bring attention to the cause of Gilad Shalit, who remains captive by Hamas. He was kidnapped in 2006. I urge all interested parties, including Egypt, to use their influence to ensure his safe return. Though not included in the legislative language, I urge the State Department to make it clear to all aid recipients of this bill that Gilad's return remains a foreign policy priority.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude and ask for this legislation to be adopted by this House to send a strong message to our troops.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.